

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

GREGORY MANEMAN et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

WEYERHAUSER COMPANY et al.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. C24-2050-KKE

ORDER GRANTING AMERICAN  
COUNCIL OF LIFE INSURERS' MOTION  
FOR LEAVE TO FILE *AMICI CURIAE*

This matter comes before the Court on the American Council of Life Insurers' ("ACLI") motion for leave to participate as *amici curiae* in support of Defendants' motions to dismiss. Dkt. No. 45. For the reasons below, the Court grants the motion. *Id.*

On December 12, 2024, Plaintiffs (Gregory Maneman, Annette Williams, Cassandra Wright, James Hollins, and Pierre Donaby) filed this putative class action against Defendants (Weyerhaeuser Company, Weyerhaeuser Company Annuity Committee, Weyerhaeuser Company Administrative Committee, State Street Global Advisors Trust Company, and Does 1–5) for breach of fiduciary duty and violations of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 ("ERISA"), 29 U.S.C § 1001 *et seq.* Dkt. No. 1. The alleged bad acts arise from Defendants' January 2019 transfer of certain pension obligations to a "highly risky private equity-controlled insurance company with a complex and opaque structure." *Id.* ¶ 3. On February 24, 2025, Defendants filed two motions to dismiss arguing Plaintiffs lack standing and fail to state a claim

1 under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6). Dkt. Nos. 32, 33. These motions will be fully  
2 briefed on May 30, 2025. Dkt. No. 42.

3 The Court previously granted the ERISA Industry Committee, the American Benefits  
4 Council, and the Committee on Investment of Employee Benefit Assets Inc. leave to submit an  
5 *amici curiae* brief in support of Defendants' motion to dismiss because it would be "of assistance  
6 to the Court in considering the 'important, historical context for the role annuity purchases play in  
7 the voluntary retirement benefit system' and 'practical perspectives on the consequences of  
8 particular outcomes.'" Dkt. No. 43 at 3 (quoting Dkt. No. 36 at 5). Now ACLI, "the leading trade  
9 association driving public policy and advocacy on behalf of the life insurance industry[.]" seeks to  
10 file an *amici curiae* brief in support of Defendants' motion to dismiss to provide "a broader gloss  
11 focusing on security of the life insurance industry." Dkt. No. 45 at 1, 2.

12 District courts have "broad discretion" regarding the appointment of amici. *Hoptowit v.*  
13 *Ray*, 682 F.2d 1237, 1260 (9th Cir. 1982), *abrogated on other grounds by Sandin v. Conner*, 515  
14 U.S. 472 (1995). Courts often welcome amicus briefs from non-parties "concerning legal issues  
15 that have potential ramifications beyond the parties directly involved." *United States v. City of*  
16 *Seattle*, No. C12-1282JLR, 2023 WL 3224497, at \*1 (W.D. Wash. May 3, 2023). "There are no  
17 strict prerequisites to qualify as amici and the Court will allow an amicus brief where, as here, the  
18 amicus has unique information that can help the court beyond the help that the lawyers for the  
19 parties are able to provide." *Wagafe v. Biden*, No. 17-cv-00094-LK, 2022 WL 457983, at \*1 (W.D.  
20 Wash. Feb. 15, 2022) (cleaned up). Further, "there is no rule that amici must be totally  
21 disinterested." *Funbus Sys., Inc. v. State of Cal. Pub. Utils. Comm'n*, 801 F.2d 1120, 1125 (9th  
22 Cir. 1986) (citation omitted); *see Hoptowit*, 682 F.2d at 1260 (affirming district court's  
23 appointment of amicus curiae even though amicus supported only one party's arguments).

1 Here, ACLI's proposed brief will assist the Court by providing context "about regulation  
2 of the [life and annuity insurance] industry and protections for insureds and annuitants." Dkt. No.  
3 45 at 2. Accordingly, the motion is GRANTED. *Id.*<sup>1</sup>

4 The Court DIRECTS the Clerk to accept for filing ACLI's proposed *amici curiae* brief  
5 (Dkt. No. 45-1). The parties may file optional responses to this brief by June 6, 2025. This order  
6 does not entitle ACLI to make a formal appearance at any hearing, participate in oral argument at  
7 any hearing, or file any reply memoranda.

8  
9 Dated this 23rd day of May, 2025.

10 

11 \_\_\_\_\_  
12 Kimberly K. Evanson  
13 United States District Judge  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

23 \_\_\_\_\_  
24 <sup>1</sup> ACLI's motion is labeled as a "motion for leave to file *amicus curiae* brief[.]" Dkt. No. 45. The Court only permits  
ACLI to file the proposed *amicus curiae* brief in support of Defendants' motion to dismiss. Dkt. No. 45-1. ACLI may  
not otherwise participate without explicit leave of the court.